

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending and stand rejected in the Office Action of November 18, 2003.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "wherein each sequential bitmap includes a repeated portion containing content that is repeated in another portion of the sequential bitmap". This amendment is supported by at least Original Claim 11 which recites "repeating a portion of the content of each associated immersive picture" and the Specification at Paragraph [0041] which recites "The content of immersive picture P\_4 in the area from edge E7 a distance back along immersive picture P\_4 is repeated in the area from edge E8 a distance forward along immersive picture P\_4".

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to depend from amended Claim 1..

No new matter is added.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7-10 under "35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeNies, U.S. Patent Application publication No. 2002/0021353".

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 based on DeNies has been rendered moot in light of the amendment of Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that DeNies does not teach or suggest a "sequential bitmap includes a repeated portion containing content that is repeated in another portion of the sequential bitmap" as recited in amended Claim 1.

The Examiner also stated that Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-18 are rejected under "35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto, U.S. Patent No. 6,567,086."

Specifically, the Examiner stated that

Figure 5 illustrates and column 4 lines 28-46 describes overlapping portions of the panoramic picture where overlapping portions are repeated portions of the panoramic picture. Figure 6(a) to 6(e) illustrates different locations for view window 620. At column 5 lines 27-49 describes various degrees of overlap and view window sizes.

With regards to the "repeated portions" the Examiner further states that "column 5 lines 28-49 describes overlapping and it is clear the overlapped portions are the same, thus, they are repeated."

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is misapplying the teachings of Hashimoto. Specifically, Hashimoto states that "the present invention provides an immersive video system which utilizes multiple video streams to display high resolution immersive videos using conventional video equipment" (emphasis added) (Hashimoto, Col. 3 lines 2-5). As illustrated in Fig. 5 of Hashimoto, the overlapped portions of Hashimoto are on two different video streams. For example, Fig. 5 illustrates that video stream 530 overlaps with video stream 540. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Hashimoto does not teach or suggest "each sequential bitmap includes a repeated portion containing content that is repeated in another portion of the sequential bitmap" as recited in amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, Hashimoto teaches that:

Conventional video equipment are designed and built to fixed standards regarding image resolution, compression, and other features, which may not provide enough bandwidth for high-quality immersive videos."

(Hashimoto, Col. 2, lines (56-60). Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that Hashimoto teaches away from the "a repeated portion containing content that is repeated in another

portion of the sequential bitmap" as recited in Claim 1 because including a repeated portion within a video stream would require even more bandwidth, which Hashimoto teaches is not adequate for immersive videos. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1. Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-10, which depend from Claim 1 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2-10.

Claim 11 recites "repeating a portion of the content of the immersive picture; storing the repeated portion together with the immersive picture to form an overlapping immersive picture". In rejecting Claim 11, the Examiner stated that "video storage medium 914 described at column 7 lines 59-64 stores multiple overlapping video streams, thus, it stores the repeated portions." Applicants respectfully submit that storing multiple overlapping video streams as cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest forming "an overlapping immersive picture" as recited in Claim 11. As explained above with respect to Claim 1 and reinforced by the Examiner's remarks, Hashimoto teaches to use multiple video streams having overlapping portions. However, Claim 11 specifically recites "storing the repeated portions together with the immersive picture to form an overlapping immersive picture" (emphasis added). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is not anticipated by Hashimoto. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 11. Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12-16, which depend from Claim 11 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 12-16.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claim 17 and 18 are rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 17 and 18.

Claim Objections

Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claim 17 and 18 are rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 17 and 18.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7, and 9-16 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If there are any questions, please telephone Edward Mao at (925) 895-3546 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Reg. #38,186  
Carrie

Customer No.: 022888

Edward S. Mao  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,713

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to:  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C., 20231, on May 18, 2004.

May 18, 2004 Carrie Reddick  
Date Signature: Carrie Reddick